<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment in the Physical Education, now Kinesiology Department has decreased 4.5% from 10,492 in 2009-2010, to 10,022 in 2011-12, which is a 3.75% increase from a low of 9,649 in 2010-2011.</td>
<td>Student success, retention and completion rates in the Physical Education, now Kinesiology Department remained relatively stable. Overall success rates were 74.5% in 2009-2010, and were 74.11% in 2011-2012. This compares with a college wide overall success rate of 65.72%. The college wide load index for the department increased from 85% in Fall 2010 to 98.4% in Fall 2011.</td>
<td>Staffing for the Physical Education/Kinesiology program is closely aligned and intertwined with the Athletics Program. Most full time and part time coaches, who are not full time instructors, receive course loads through the Kinesiology program, to support their coaching assignment and to strengthen the conditioning and training of the student athletes. In 2009, the PE/Kinesiology program employed 16 full time instructors and a total of 42 part time instructors. By Spring 2011, the part time faculty had decreased by 16.7 % to 35 and the full time decreased by 6.2% to 15 full time instructors (long-time instructor, Carol Poto retired.) Department Chair, Wilbert Shaw retired at the end of Spring 2011, leaving the Department with 14 full time instructors,</td>
<td>See Program Review narrative and Physical Education/Recreation Assessment Plan, as well as Kinesiology course assessment plans for additional information on both program and course level Student Learning Outcomes Physical Education/Recreation Program SLO’s: SLO #1-Students will demonstrate knowledge of rules, strategies, techniques, and etiquette of various activities to promote lifelong fitness. SLO #2- Students will demonstrate knowledge of basic aspects of a training/fitness program. SLO#3- Physical Education/Recreation majors will recognize various career opportunities in the field of human movement. SLO#4-Students will be able to define the</td>
<td>See Program Review narrative and Kinesiology Department Plan for explication of the Kinesiology/Recreation Program Goals. Goals: Strengthen career offerings through Certificate Development in the areas of: Sports Management, Athletic Training, Personal/Fitness Training and Athletic Coaching. Develop relevant, contemporary curriculum and increase articulation agreements with CSU’s and other institutions of higher education. Expand instructional modalities, including online course offerings, to benefit student success. Strengthen and Revitalize the Kinesiology/Recreation Program Curriculum Guide. Increase Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FTE’s fell 13.1% from a high of 502.66 in Fall ’09 to 436.77 in Spring ’12. WSCH increased --5.7% from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011 from 13,612.5 to 14,439. Course sections were decreased 9.9% from 202 in Fall ’09 to 182 in Spring’12. The greatest drop in course sections was at PCC, from 15 in 2009-2010 to 6 in 2010-2012, representing a 60% change. This was due to...
# Program Review

**For Cycle 2012-13 (2\textsuperscript{nd} Year Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a move into a smaller, temporary facility, during the renovation of the CC Building.</th>
<th>representing a 12.5% decrease, going forward into fall ‘12. The last full time faculty hire was in Spring 2006 when Suzanne Witmer was hired as a full time instructor and Women’s Volleyball coach.</th>
<th>many health related and skill related fitness components in an exercise program.</th>
<th>Professionalism. Study appropriate areas of pedagogical emphasis for faculty hiring priorities and needs. Increase marketing, communication and awareness of career paths and college transfer opportunities within the Kinesiology discipline and major. Strengthen and define the role of the Adapted Kinesiology courses within the Kinesiology/Recreation program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not including the KINIA intercollegiate athletic course offerings, average class size rose by 37%, with as much as a 52% increase from the KINPF offerings at the Pacific Coast Campus. At the same time, the number of faculty was reduced by 9.5% (32.075 to 29.027 FTEF from Fall 2009 to Fall 2011.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6. College Wide Overall – How does this information fit with the College Wide Goals? |

---

# Program Review Questions

Name of Program being reviewed: **KINESIOLOGY/RECREATION**

1–3. **Enrollment, Achievement, and HR Data**

The Kinesiology Department data indicates that the department is doing more with less. The department had a total enrollment in 2011-12 of 10,022. That is an increase from 9649 in 2010-2011 despite a 9.9\% decrease.
Program Review  
For Cycle 2012-13 (2\textsuperscript{nd} Year Group) 

in total sections offered. Not including the KINIA intercollegiate athletic course offerings, average class size rose by 37\%, with as much as a 52\% increase from the KINPF offerings at the Pacific Coast Campus. This is an important achievement considering the recent implementation of the Physical Fitness/Wellness requirement in Plan A.

WSCH increased from 13,612.5 in fall ‘10 to 14,439.29 in fall ‘11. While WSCH increased 5.7\%, FTES decreased by 13.1\%, from a high of 502.66 in fall ‘09 to 436.77 in spring ‘12.

Program Load has increased by 4.7\% from 2009 – 2012. While Program Load is at 494, well below the accepted norm of 525, this can be explained because the Kinesiology Department statistics also include the KINIA—Intercollegiate Athletic courses. These courses do not have the minimum “caps” associated with a standard course because these courses accommodate teams that may range in numbers from 7 – 80 + student athletes. This association of smaller “capped” courses is standard to Kinesiology/Athletic programs statewide.

In 2011-12, the Department had an overall success rate of 74.11\% compared to 65.72\% college wide.

The College Wide Index shows a marked improvement of 15.25\% from 83.4\% in 2009 to 98.4\% in 2011. In total, these indicators are positive signs and clearly show that Department Faculty are performing well despite budget challenges, and that students are engaged in the Kinesiology Department instructional program.

In studying the data of each of the program focus areas (KINA, KING, KINIA, KINPF, KINPP) interesting patterns emerge:

**KINA**—Adapted Kinesiology courses show a 68\% increase in enrollment from ’09-10 to ’11-12, coupled with an 83\% decrease in section offerings from 6 to 1 during this same timeframe. Overall success rate of this focused area remains high at 90.63\%. Department faculty realizes this is an area that needs careful attention. The DSPS and Disabled Veterans student population is growing while at the same time budget allocation for this program is decreasing. In summer ’12, the new Department Head had to solicit funds from the college Foundation Adapted Associates group to keep the one section for degree seeking students viable. While this is unacceptable, the Adapted faculty understands that they need to work more closely with the DSPS and Veterans Program to establish communication of need, and to properly maintain appropriate program guidelines.

**KING**—General courses of study include the traditional sport patterned courses. These remain popular with students and are schedule constrained by facilities and equipment. The KING focus realized a 5.7\% decrease in the number of sections offered between fall ’09 and spring’11. Enrollment increased during that same time by 2.16\%, clearly another indicator that the Department faculty is cooperating fully with college goals of increased student access to courses. The success rate for this focused area is 78.32\%.

**KINIA**—These Inter-collegiate course offerings were discussed briefly in the narrative and are discussed more in depth in the Athletic Program Review.
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KINOS—The Outdoor Studies focus of course offerings were discontinued and inactivated in fall’11. Budget cuts forced the elimination of this area of Kinesiology program study. This is an area that bears continued attention, as the course (backpacking) when offered was extremely popular, with a waitlist of 100% more students than the class total enrollment. Success rate for this focused area was 63.33%.

KINPF—Physical Fitness—The KINPF focus area represents the largest concentration of students with an overall enrollment of 6,354 in 2011-12, which represents an 8.2% decrease from 2009-2010. This can be explained in part due to a 6.56% decrease in the number of course sections offered.

Also, a large number of students are enrolled in KINPF sections at the Pacific Coast Campus. Due to flooding of the CC building in spring 2010, nine (9) course sections were dropped (a 60% reduction) from the curriculum in fall 2010 to present, as the current temporary facility (GG-bottom floor) does not have the appropriate space for these courses. This resulted in a 43.6% loss of students (258) from spring’10 to fall ‘10. Since that semester, the PCC faculty changed instructional methods to allow for greater access, and enrollment rebounded by 34.3% to 507 students by spring 2012. Kinesiology faculty at PCC raised the class capacities to allow these students access to the 6 sections (60% reduction) still currently offered while in the temporary location. The new Fitness Center Facility at PCC is slated to open in spring ’13.

Waitlists for the KINPF sections are notoriously higher (88.5%) than any of the other focus areas. The college waitlist average for this same timeframe is 72%, much lower than KINPF. Success rates for this focused area are 71.65%.

The KINPF 54 Weight Training and KINPF 81, 83, 84 Fitness and Wellness center courses pose the highest demand of all Physical Fitness offerings. It will be important for Kinesiology faculty to pay careful attention to these statistics moving forward, as the new Title 5 (section 55041—repeatable courses) and local interpretation of such, prohibits a student from taking these courses more than once. Also, the new Vice President of Instruction, Dr. Gaither Loewenstein does not feel that the Fitness Center model of instruction is pedagogically efficient and therefore the faculty will be abandoning that format in favor of prescribed course offerings beginning fall ’13.

KINPP—The Professional Preparation/Theory courses offered by the Department speak to the some of the required core courses for the Teaching/Non-Teaching major. These are primarily lecture courses with an activity component. Recent changes to KINPP 1—Introduction to Kinesiology, reflect a unit value increase from 2 to 3 units, to match the CSU “like” course for articulation. The KINPP focused area shows a 14% decrease in enrollment, which corresponds to the 30% decrease in section offerings from 2009 to 2012. The success rate for this focused area is 74.18%. It is interesting to note that this is the one area that offers multiple instruction modalities; face to face and a web based course. Success rate for the web based course is 49%, and 73.68% for the face to face mode. As the department looks to expand web based instruction modalities in this focused area, this is a statistic that will need to be studied further, in collaboration with the distance learning area, for student academic success.

STAFFING
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The Kinesiology Department faculty is the department’s most valuable instructional resource. In 2009 the Kinesiology Program employed 16 full-time instructors and 42 part-time instructors. Many of these employees coach and teach for the Department as a part of their regular contract or faculty load assignments. The Department has realized a 16.7% decrease in the number of part-time faculty, and a 12.5% decrease in full-time faculty, with the retirement of 2 full-time instructors (Carol Poto and Department Chair, Wil Shaw) during spring ’11 and spring ’12 respectively. The last full-time faculty hire was in spring ’06 when Suzanne Witmer was hired as an instructor and Women’s Volleyball Coach. It is important to note that the last full-time hire, who wasn’t hired primarily to coach, was Marvin Miller in 1998. This is data that the Department must be aware of and pay close attention to, as we focus on Department Plan and Program Review goals and projects. The Department faculty recognize, that in order to strengthen the curriculum, such as the possibility of an Exercise Science TMC, and the Physical Fitness, Wellness and Conditioning curriculum, attention must be paid to hiring faculty with particular discipline focus.

In addition to a decline in faculty, the Department has had a 100% decrease in support staff. In 2011, college wide budget cuts and reallocation of funds, caused the area to lose Administrative Assistant (Karen Johnson.) Since 2011, there has been no clerical or administrative assistant help assigned to the Department. This places a huge burden on the Department Chair and the Department faculty.

The Department has performed well despite the challenges created by recent changes and budget cuts. The Department faculty is proud of our continued positive impact on students.

---

4. SLOs

**Kinesiology/Recreation Program Assessment:**

**SLO #1**- Students will demonstrate knowledge of rules, strategies, techniques, and etiquette of various activities to promote lifelong fitness.

**Response:** Multiple choice questions were selected and developed by the Physical Education, now Kinesiology, faculty. Questions were to be embedded in subject matter written exams. It was decided that the questions were NOT to be considered in the overall grade for the exam. Of the 7 instructors who administered this SLO, those 7 primarily teach FITNESS courses at PCC. The student results showed that 42% of the student who successfully completed the course scored with 100% correctness to the questions. It was determined that because rules of activities and etiquette of sport activities are not primarily taught in FITNESS courses, this outcome was not met, as it does not adequately apply to FITNESS courses. Faculty who teach GENERAL and ATHLETIC courses did not participate in this outcome assessment.

**SLO #2**- Students will demonstrate knowledge of basic aspects of a training/fitness program.
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Response: Multiple choice questions were selected and developed by the Kinesiology faculty. Questions were to be embedded in subject matter written exams. It was decided that the questions were NOT to be considered in the overall grade for the exam. Of the 7 instructors who administered this SLO, those 7 primarily teach Fitness courses at PCC. The student results showed that 88% of the students who successfully completed the course scored with 100% correctness to the questions. It was determined that faculty will utilize the questions through the next review cycle. More data collection and participation from faculty is needed to adequately assess this outcome.

SLO #3- Physical Education/Recreation majors will recognize various career opportunities in the field of human movement.

Response: The assessment task was an oral exit interview with the Department Chair. There is no data for this outcome. Expectation was that Physical Education/Recreation majors would meet with the Department Chair for an exit interview. Data shows that declared or identified majors have dwindled to less than 10 in the last few years. Apparently NO students identified themselves, or were identified as majors in 2011 as the Department Chair, Wil Shaw, interviewed no majors.

The current Kinesiology Department faculty took steps to change the department name from Physical Education to Kinesiology for better coordination and articulation with transferring institutions of higher education. Additionally, the Department faculty has taken steps to implement the Kinesiology AA Transfer Curriculum. This outcome will be deleted from this Program Assessment Plan, and transferred to the NEW Program Assessment Plan for the Kinesiology AA-T, along with a more manageable assessment approach.

SLO #4- Students will be able to define the many health related and skill related fitness components in an exercise program.

Response: This assessment task utilized a Department survey. All students who had taken more than one Physical Education/Recreation course were given the survey. Full-time faculty administered the survey, with 9 of 15 instructors participating. More than 400 surveys were collected and tabulated. Of the students who qualified to take the survey, 88% demonstrated proficient knowledge to satisfy this outcome assessment. Participating faculty felt the survey was successful, but will modify questions that confused students. Additionally, the faculty will add more “skill related” prompts to the survey, as it was too heavily weighted towards fitness and wellness information.

b) Based on analysis of course and program SLO assessment:

- How are program-level and course-level SLOs being implemented, assessed, and used for program improvement?
- Summarize how the program has responded to SLO assessment results.
- Discuss how each action/change is based on ASLO results and how it will contribute to the improvement of the program.
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Response:

There is really no good excuse to explain the lack of effort and data produced during this initial Program Assessment cycle. However, factors contributing to these “light” results are:

1. Lack of Department leadership
2. Lack of accountability
3. Confusion by Department faculty between COURSE review assessments and PROGRAM review assessments

In spite of the dismal results, the Kinesiology faculty has learned a great deal about their course curricular offerings, stated mission of the Kinesiology/Recreation program, program outcomes, mode of delivery, communication within the Department and to the college community. The first Program Assessment Plan, while lacking in hard data, served to get the faculty communicating with one another in ways they had not in more than 12 years, and pointed to the need for immediate change. Due to lack of a strong leadership structure, Department meetings were not a viable means of obtaining college communication and information. FLEX days attempts at ASLO training was met with varied levels of engagement by Department faculty. Only a handful of faculty helped develop the course and program SLO’s and assessment tasks. Buy-in was minimal as 9 of the full-time faculty primarily focused on coaching assignments.

This way of operation has come to a swift close. The limited data produced opened the eyes of the Department faculty. Results showed a need for rapid change and complete buy-in from all. The Department completed a name change from Physical Education to Kinesiology (fall ’12) and the KIN AA-T was developed (due for complete sign-off from the Chancellor’s office in fall ’12.) Results showed the immediate need for a complete review and update of the Physical Education/Recreation curriculum guide, program and courses.

The Department has new leadership and Department faculty show a renewed commitment. Information indicates that during the last 10 years, faculty approached Department leadership to develop new curriculum, but were discouraged from doing so. There has been a 360 degree change in this area. Since June 2012, the faculty has been actively engaged in writing limited new courses, reactivating old courses and changing current course offerings. The Kinesiology faculty is a talented, diverse group of content experts, who are now getting the opportunity to display their expertise and professionalism.

Planning meetings are now scheduled regularly alongside department meetings. The faculty is engaged in research, professional activities at the state and national level, and as “faculty mentors” to the students in the newly formed Kinesiology Majors Club.

Expectations are that in the next Program Assessment Cycle, results that are truly reflective of the Kinesiology/Recreation curriculum offerings, student achievements, faculty achievements and a solid analysis of course and program outcomes with measureable, meaningful data, will be available for further program improvements.
5. Goals

a) Based on the data from questions 1 – 4 and any other relevant internal or external data your department has collected, how have your department and program goals developed and changed over the past three years?

Response:

Based on Program Assessment and Course Assessment Plans, and influenced by internal and external challenges, the measureable GOALS/Projects in place for the Kinesiology Program are:

1. Certificate Development:

   To strengthen the career component of the Kinesiology/Recreation curriculum, certificates will be developed in Sports Management, Athletic Training, Personal/Fitness Training and Athletic Coaching.
   
   US Bureau of Labor and Statistics indicate projected growth in the following areas within the field of Kinesiology by 2018: A. Athletic Training 37%, B. Personal Trainer 29.4%, C. Fitness Specialist 29%, D. Sports Coach 25%, E. Physical Therapist 30.3%.

   Certificate development speaks directly to the job market analysis in preparing students for career opportunities within the field of Kinesiology. The Faculty has begun work towards implementation with the analysis and study of necessary course creation for certificate development.

   Goal timeline: October 2012 – December 2013

2. PCC Curricular Offerings:

   An analysis of PCC curriculum indicates a real lack of course creativity and offerings. In part, this is due to facilities constraints. This will be remedied with the opening of the new Fitness Facility (slated for opening spring ‘13.) This goal supports the Education Master Plan in the Equity and Student Success areas, and the PCC Education Plan (2011.) The faculty is actively engaged in working on the types of courses that may be offered at PCC to support certificate and degree attainment, and the Kinesiology General Education curriculum.

   Goal timeline: October 2012 – June 2014

3. Curriculum Development:
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Develop relevant, contemporary curriculum and increase the articulation agreements with CSUs and other institutions of higher education. For quality student instruction and learning; transfer readiness and accessibility to higher education institutions, the Kinesiology/Recreation curriculum is in dire need of an update. Additionally, to be able to comply with Title 5 (section 55041—repeatable courses) and local interpretation of such, the Kinesiology faculty must spend time re-working curricular offerings to maximize student access and educational benefit.

Goal timeline: October 2012 – March 2013

4. Increase Instructional Modalities:

An expansion of online course offerings and other methods of instruction to benefit student success will be studied, developed and implemented. As the Kinesiology Curriculum is expanding in breadth and depth, varied instructional modalities need to be developed. Student access to required and recommended theory courses, with modalities other than face-to-face, must be explored as more students discover the career paths, discipline emphasis and transfer opportunities available to them. With a decrease in faculty and corresponding course load hours, methods to increase student access are necessary.

Goal timeline: October 2012 – December 2014

5. Strengthen and Define the Adapted Kinesiology Course offerings:

The Adapted Kinesiology Program serves an under-represented population. Strengthening the ties between DSPS and the Kinesiology Department will better serve this student group. Examining course offerings, and determining need based upon the influx of the growing DSPS and Disabled Veteran Students populations will help guide the future of this portion of the Kinesiology/Recreation curriculum.

Goal timeline: October 2012 – December 2013

6. College Wide
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Discuss how the program SLOs as well as the department goals integrate, articulate, and complement the institutional goals and initiatives. (How does your department fit into the big picture?)

Response:

The Kinesiology/Recreation program has a wide and ranging scope of curricular offerings for multiple goals that align with the more focused institutional mission and goals. Transfer degree, General Education requirements, career certificates and Associates Degree all are part of the Kinesiology Department’s contribution to LBCC student success.

Heretofore, this review has focused on the Kinesiology Program’s support of the Educational Master Plan in the areas of Student Success and Equity.

The review also aligns with the PCC Education Plan (2011) in the areas of Curriculum Development, Improved Learning Environment and Marketing.

Moreover, the Kinesiology Program addresses the President’s 24-month agenda (2012-2014) in the area of Student Success through the development of information driven decision making to improve student learning and organizational effectiveness.